

## **Minutes of the meeting of the Pharmacy Practices Committee (PPC) held on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> August at 0945 hrs via MS Teams**

The composition of the PPC at this Hearing was:

Chair: Mr Martin Connor

Present: **Lay Members Appointed by NHS Lothian**

Mr Mike Ash

Mr John Niven

### **Pharmacist Members Nominated by the Area Pharmaceutical Committee**

Mr Vinny Bilon, included in Pharmaceutical list

Mr John Connelly, included in Pharmaceutical list

Ms Hazel Garven, not included in Pharmaceutical list

## **1. NAP Chairman's Appeal decision on the appeal by TPB Partnership LLP 269 High Street Linlithgow EH49 7EP**

- 1.1 The NAP Chairman ruled in the appellant's favour in terms of Grounds of Appeal 1 in that the panel reconsidering the appeal issue was not quorate. The original appeal reason upheld was that there had been a failure of the Board to properly narrate the facts or reasons upon which their determination of the application was based.
- 1.2 This was specifically to do with the PPC referring to its own analysis when discounting the view of Mr Jamieson from Boots that the low uptake of Pharmacy First was due to the area being affluent, and patients would rather meet the cost of items out of their own pocket.
- 1.3 The NAP chairman has remitted this issue back for reconsideration by a quorate panel.

## **2. Meeting of PPC**

- 2.1 The panel reconvened to consider the evidence relating to the Pharmacy First uptake issue, and again agreed that the language used in the original minute had been unfortunate and did not clearly narrate the reasons for the conclusion reached.
- 2.2 The committee then discussed in detail the evidence on the issue of Pharmacy First uptake.
- 2.3 The committee noted Mr Jamieson's assertions about the affluence of the area and the ability of patients to meet costs out of their own pocket. The committee noted that Mr Jamieson did not back this up directly with evidence but did in answer to a subsequent question saying his view was formed from the information on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation.

- 2.4 The committee noted that the representative of the Community Council had held a contrary view that statistics for the area surrounding the High Street proved it to be one of the most deprived areas in Scotland.  
The committee noted Mr Green's submission that statistics for the year of 2022 stated that pharmacy first uptake in Linlithgow Boots was less than half the national average.  
The committee noted the evidence from the community council representative that there was a long-held view within the community that service from the pharmacies had been poor for some time.  
The committee noted that other affluent areas did have reasonable uptake of pharmacy first.
- 2.5 The committee then considered the various submissions to the hearing which related to the provision of service.
- 2.6 The letter from the Linlithgow Group Medical Practice outlined an increasing pressure on the two pharmacies over several years. The pharmacies had been unable to cope with the increased pressure and workload, leading to long waits for prescriptions and patients not being able to access pharmacy first services.
- 2.7 The letter from Fiona Hyslop MSP in which she outlined concerns for elderly constituents not being able to get medicines in a timely fashion due to the pressures and difficulties with the local pharmaceutical provision.
- 2.8 The individual responses to the CAR in many cases cited issues of pressure in the system, long waits, long queues and poor service.
- 2.9 The members of the committee who had been on the original hearing panel then outlined their own site visits to the pharmacies. All agreed that they had encountered queues at the pharmacies during their visits. In some of these cases the queues were out of the door and into the street.
- 2.10 The discussion having concluded the pharmacists then left the meeting.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 The committee concluded that after reconsideration of the evidence that they believed that pressure in the system had led to the low uptake of pharmacy first services rather than the appellant's view that it was down to the affluent nature of the area.**
- 3.2 The committee were unanimous in their view that this issue was only one of the concerns that had led to their original decision. Having now reconsidered this matter the committee agreed that the original decision to find in favour of the applicant was correct and should stand.**

Signed by Martin Connor, PPC Chair

Date 20<sup>th</sup> August 2024